

ho, professional enlisted men and women and NCO's and an officer corps ready to do the job.

However, do they feel some hurt that the Commander in Chief is using them politically? That we do not see on the television news or in the newspaper reports. You bet they do. To a man they feel they are being used, and I will talk about that tomorrow.

WHAT IT IS LIKE TO BE IN WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, when I go home, especially over the last Christmas break, people ask me, well, how do you like being in Congress? Is it an honor? Is it fun? Are you going to receptions? What is it like to be in Washington?

Often I respond by telling them a story about my Uncle Oly and Aunt Lena. I, like many in Minnesota, am of Norwegian ancestry. And Oly and Lena one morning were in the house and Oly got up, excused himself, went out to the outhouse, and did his business. As he pulled up his bib overalls, a couple quarters dropped out and went down the hole. Oly was disgusted. He took off his watch and he threw that down, and he took out his wallet and threw that down as well.

He went back in the house and Lena said well, "Oly, what is wrong with you? You are in such a foul mood and you don't smell so good either. What you been doing?" And finally it came out. Oly explained to her that he had lost the quarters and thrown his watch and wallet, and she said, "Oly, why did you do that? Why can you go down there?" He said, "Well, you didn't think I was going to go down after just 50 cents, did you?"

Well, there may be some humor in what Uncle Oly did, but there is little humor in what we are about here in Washington. We have all been regaled with stories about the shutdown, its impact on innocent Federal employees, about individuals that need passports to attend funerals, its impact on servicemen, national parks, veterans who are seeking guarantees for loans, businesses that are seeking guarantees from the Small Business Administration, and a vast array of others in America.

It is truly a tragic situation. And the best I can say to folks at home is it is a highly frustrating experience to serve in Congress these days. I have been here exactly 3 years, and I have had to say it has been frustrating each of these 3 years.

In the first 2 years, many of us chafed under rules that prohibited what we perceived to be a majority in Congress from considering legislation that we felt was important for the American people. Now, under the leadership of a new Speaker and a different

political party, we continue to cave under the same techniques of managing the business of the House of Representatives.

I would say to my brethren on the other side of the aisle, I certainly shared with you the dismay and frustration when good proposals were held up. Certainly you must understand that the same is happening today, and that altogether too often the rules of the House are being used to keep important initiatives from consideration by the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. This is certainly happening at this time as I speak.

This leadership is preventing what I would consider to be the majority of the Members of this body from considering a continuing resolution to put Federal employees back to work. Similarly, I expect that the discipline of each political party in this institution is preventing the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives from honestly considering a 7-year deficit reduction plan that actually would work to balance the budget and would have broad support throughout our Nation. It is tragic when the majority so manipulates the rules. I do not care if the majority is Republican or the majority is Democrat, the tragedy is the same.

I think it is important that all of us work together on a bipartisan basis to try to make this institution as effective as possible. Forget about the next election. Forget about who gets credit. Instead, focus on how do we balance the budget, what is right for America, what do the American people expect of us?

I think that if we focus on these considerations, the frustration that I and many others have felt can be overcome. But unless we do that, we, like Oly, are simply going to go back home with a foul odor, that will be immediately noticed by our friends and family and residents of our district. We certainly can handle our responsibilities in a better fashion.

REASONS FOR LACK OF PROGRESS ON BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this 5-minute special order to discuss the budget and my concerns with the lack of progress and really the lack of response from the administration.

We have heard continuously from some of those Members on the minority side that this really has been caused by a group of so-called radical freshmen Republican Members. Well, I rise as a five-term Republican who over the 10 years I have been in Congress have supported and worked with my colleagues on the other side on labor issues, even opposing NAFTA when my party and this President supported

NAFTA; working with Members of the other side on issues like family and medical leave; issues involving reform of Davis-Bacon that is acceptable to the labor unions and the working people of this country; and working on environmental issues and environmental legislation, opposing the riders that were attempted to be inserted in the bill. So I am not someone who rises as someone who has always been against the President. To the contrary, I have been supportive of some of the issues that this administration has supported.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what this debate is about. This debate really is about this President finally being called to task to live up to commitments that he has made publicly. He has gotten away with saying one thing and doing something else on numerous occasions that I cannot cite here today. But in this instance, Members on our side, even those of us who have worked with the President on key issues, are saying "We want to see this President simply come forward and do what he said he would do, and that is to provide for us a detailed seven-year plan to balance the budget."

Now, why has he not done that? It is because he is reading the political tea leaves and polls. He knows if he comes out with a 7-year plan in detail, he is either going to offend senior citizens or offend those business groups where he told them he would support a capital gains tax cut, or he is going to offend those veterans who he has told he will not have any changes in the way we fund veterans programs, or he is going to offend those defense workers by having to say we need additional cuts in defense, even though he was out in California last week and even made the case, and I cannot believe this, as the Republican who opposed the B-2 bomber, this. He even went so far as to say "Yes, we may need more than 20 B-2 bombers." Talk about ultimate irony, for this President to make that statement.

You see, if this President comes out with a detailed 7-year plan that lays out specifics like we have, he is going to take some heat, and this President does not like to take heat.

Mr. Speaker, the time for this rhetoric and demagoguery has ended. As I said earlier today, the Philadelphia Enquirer, no bastion of conservative politics in this country, said it best today in one of their lead editorials. The headline is, "Your turn, Bill. Clinton must offer the serious budget he promised."

I will insert this editorial in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, but let me read the final paragraph of the editorial.

Congress should pass stopgap funding as soon as the President provides the missing ingredient of serious bargaining: A credible White House plan to balance the budget in seven years.

Even the Philadelphia Enquirer has now read through the demagoguery of this President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear opponents on the other side say "You are offending the American people. They do not buy what you are doing. It is wrong." That may be the case. But let me just remind them of one plain and simple fact: Since Bill Clinton took office 3 years ago, there have now been as of today 182 publicly elected officials switch parties in this country; 182, Mr. Speaker. All 182 who switched parties, from Maine to Washington State, to the southern States, were Democrats who switched to the Republican Party. All 182 publicly elected officials, including 7 Members of the U.S. Congress, have now distanced themselves from this President.

□ 1630

So my colleagues on the other side may be right. Maybe the President has it all right and in the end this game of smoke and mirrors and images and perceptions will win. I think not. I think the American people are smarter than that, and these 182 elected officials who have switched parties and joined the Republican Party agree with us that this President must finally do what he said that he wants to do, and that is give us a detailed plan. If he does that, I will join with the Philadelphia Enquirer tomorrow, or tonight, and I will vote for a CR to get the Federal employees back to work, but I want to see the President's detailed plan.

Where is it and when will we see it? Now is the time, Mr. President. Provide us your detailed plan for balancing the Federal budget.

PRIVATE BUSINESSES WOULD NOT SHUT DOWN THE WAY GOVERNMENT HAS SHUT DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last year there was a popular film in our country called "Dumb and Dumber." I often wondered why they did not call it "Dumb and Dumbest." Ah, because that would convey the message a little bit better. But now I understand the reason, unfortunately, is the dumbest idea has been reserved for action taken by this Congress.

I have been in public life 12 years, and I am sad to say that this furlough is the dumbest thing I have seen government do in my 12 years in business. I have come down to this well several times to talk about the furlough, which is, in effect, paying people either to stay home or telling them that they have to work and they are not going to get paid.

I have basically issued a challenge, a little contest, if you will, because I am still looking for one business, one business in this entire country that twice in the same year would get so mad at itself that it would tell its workers go home, stay at home, and I am going to pay you. I have not got a call from a

single business in this country that would do that.

I was on a talk radio show last week in my district, and I did have a caller who called in and said, "Well, I love what Speaker GINGRICH is doing and I support what he is doing." I said, "Well, let me ask you this, then. Would you, if you were using your own money, send your employees home, tell them to stay at home and that you were going to pay them?" And he hemmed and hawed a little and said, "No, I would not." I said, "Well, I find it interesting that we now have the leadership in Congress who has come here and said we are going to run Congress like a business when there is not a single business in this country that would run itself the way Congress is running itself right now." It does not make any sense at all.

Now, what should we be doing today? We are in special orders now, and the reason we are in special orders is because the Speaker and the majority will not let us even vote on a measure to get these people back to work. The Senate has passed it unanimously. The majority leader in the Senate was quoted as saying, "Enough is enough." And enough is enough. These are people who want to work, who should be working, and who should be getting paid.

Now, I hear Members from the other side come down into the well and talk about sacrifice and that there is a greater mission here and a greater good. Those are not people who talk to the people I talk to in my district, because I fielded as many calls as I could from employees.

I talked to a woman who works for the FBI in Milwaukee who commutes 100 miles a day, who has two foster children, who is living from paycheck to paycheck.

I talked to a woman who works in the U.S. attorney's office, who is being forced to work and is not being paid. There are people in our neighborhood, the husband works for the VA hospital, two small children, his wife is at home. He is required to work and is not being paid.

This morning I talked to a guard at the Oxford Federal Prison in Wisconsin. Three hundred employees are being required to work but are not being paid. I said, "Well, what type of people do you have at the Oxford Prison?" He said, "We have a lot of drug offenders. Most of the people here have violent pasts." We are asking Federal guards to guard people who have been convicted of murder and selling drugs, and we are asking them to work without pay.

Mr. Speaker, that is unconscionable. That should not happen in the United States. That should not happen in England. That should not happen in any country in this world.

Again, we hear the speakers on the other side talk about sacrifice. The gentleman from Florida earlier talked about how moved he was that he talked

to an older gentleman, a senior citizen on Meals on Wheels, and that gentleman said, the senior citizen purportedly said that he was willing to give up a meal in order to get a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask any citizen in this country to give up a meal so that we can pass a bill that has tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the wealthiest people in this country. It is wrong and we should not be doing it.

Mr. Speaker, again, the Members on the other side talk about sacrifice, and it is necessary for these employees to sacrifice. Again, I was in my district talking to employees and they asked the obvious question. "What about you, Mr. Congressman? Why are you not sacrificing?" And to be honest, my initial response to them was, I have got a wife and I have got two children to support. And they jeered. They said so do we.

I had to go home and think about that. I had to go home and think about it, even though I voted every time to get these people back to work. I had to think about the fact that they are in the same situation as I am. I have a 1- and 3-year-old at home and a wife at home. I do not want to give up my pay.

But, Mr. Speaker, I decided today that I should do what many of my colleagues have done and that is to say that I will put myself in the same position as the other Federal employees. If we are asking them to sacrifice, well, then we should sacrifice, too. And I ask my colleagues to do the same thing, and that will end this misery.

IMPASSE ON FEDERAL BUDGET AND GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN ARE SEPARATE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we face today two separate controversies, two separate controversies that have been combined and confused, deliberately and improperly combined and confused.

The first controversy is the impasse on the Federal budget. This impasse involves real and serious issues. The Republicans want to balance the budget and they want to make huge cuts in Medicare and in Medicaid in order to pay for a very large tax cut benefiting mostly the wealthiest Americans. Democrats, for the most part, want to balance the budget, but they want to do it while protecting Medicare and Medicaid, college loans, education, and the environment.

These are serious differences and serious issues, and their outcome will determine the fundamental direction the country will take over the next few years, and these controversies deserve real and perhaps lengthy and extended debate. But this controversy should not lead to a shutdown of the Federal Government.